CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2022/5263/P

Case Officer:	Application Address:			
	Land adjacent to St Aloysius R.C. Church and the Prince Arthur Public House			
Obote Hope	Eversholt Street			
	London			
	NW1 1BX			

Proposal(s)

The erection of temporary structure for a mixed use coffee shop (Class E) and art gallery (Class F).

Representations								
	No. notified	0	No. of responses	3	No. of objections	2		
Consultations:					No of comments	1		
					No of support	0		
Summary of representations	A resident of Levita House objected to the application on the following grounds:							
	Design, appearance and location of the Portacabin;							
(Officer response(s)	2. loss of privacy;							
in italics)	 The commercial use of the premises as an art studio/gallery and coffee shop is considered to attract clientele that would imbalance the area; 							
	4. Create a blockage to traffic on a narrow corner and disabled people							

may not be able to pass.

Officers comments are as follows:

- 1. Whilst it is noted that the proposal is not in keeping with the scale, character, or appearance of the area, the structure is temporary and the works are reversible therefore, the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the character or appearance of the wider area.
- 2. Officers consider the proposal would not be more harmful than the previous seating area for the public house which previously occupied the site.
- 3. The use of the property as a community hub would be in accordance with the NPPF which promotes community based schemes that offer creativity and contributes to improving the local economy with both social and environmental conditions. Notwithstanding this, the proposal is also considered to be an efficient use of land for small and medium size businesses. Thus, it would be a welcome addition.
- 4. There would be no impact on pedestrian safety or footpath distances as the development is within the curtilage of the site. As the proposal is for a temporary basis only, there would be no serious long term visual harm.

A resident of Crowndale Court objected to the application on the following grounds;

- 1. the application undermines genuine community use;
- 2. existence of a museum within close proximity of the site that would impact on the prosperity of that unit;
- 3. As containers, the proposed development only adds to this unpleasing streetscape

Officers comments are as follows;

- 1. It is not anticipated that the proposal would undermine community use and as addressed above in the previous objection, it should be noted that community use can be classed as a development which promote social interaction, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other, which this proposal is likely to achieve.
- 2. Officers do not consider that the proposal would have an impact with the premises at 52 Phoenix Road. The proposed unit would be used as a gallery showcasing artwork rather than a museum which display

artworks alongside other artifacts or displays, but they do not focus on showing and selling art. These are different business models and it is not anticipated that the proposal would have a detrimental impact with the vitality and viability of this property.

3. The structure is temporary and the works are reversable therefore, the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the character or appearance of the wider area.

A resident of 50 Eversholt Street commented as follows:

- 1. Euston Station Interface 5 year plan and how the proposal would correspond with the station lifespan;
- 2. Corner of Eversholt Street and Phoenix Road would be busier than before due to the food bank;
- 3. Its present use for an outside drinking area for the pub seems to be essential for the survival of the Arthur Pub, and;
- 4. There is already a coffee shop nearby.

Officers comments are as follows;

- 1. The proposal is a temporary arrangement for a period of 5 years. And the proposal would not be supported on a permanent basis;
- 2. It is not considered that the proposal would impact on the existing food bank arrangement;
- 3. The proposal is not considered to have an impact on the existing pub. The proposal would not be competing with the existing drinking establishment but could bring more customers to this location.
- 4. It is duly noted that the proposed site is in close proximity to other commercial units. However, the existing plot is underused and officers are of the opinion that coffee shop/art gallery would be a temporary welcome addition to the area.

Recommendation:-

Grant planning permission